12. Modification of the Karampathippu Rules.

Mr. V. S. Krishna Pillai (Member, Tiruvalla taluk) said that Karampathippu Rules were passed with the object of levying *rajabhogam* on jenmom lands alienated for money consideration. No change was introduced by the rules in respect of the Devaswom and Brahmaswom lands, on which a *rajabhogam* of $\frac{1}{8}$ assessment whenever they were alienated for money consideration, and of $\frac{1}{4}$ assessment when they were sold outright by private transaction or decree of court, was already chargeable. In respect of the Madampimarvaka lands, the existing rates were modified and fixed at $\frac{1}{2}$ assessment in both the above cases. Under the new rules, the tenants who enjoyed Madampimarvaka lands on otti or kanapattom had to pay four times the *rajabhogam* they had to pay before. In certain cases the amount was more than fourfold. Under the Pokkuvaravu Rules, dated the 7th July 1914, a transfer of registry was necessary on occasions of voluntary transfer, transfer by decree of court, or by succession affecting the property. On all such occasions the new tax under the Karampathippu Rules had to be imposed. Hence all the Madampimarvaka lands had to pay the tax. In the case of garden lands, all the trees that existed at the time of levying the *rajabhogam* would be taken into account for the purpose of fixing the pattom under Rule 8. The provision was hard because in all cases the number of yielding trees would be greater since the settlement period, and the assessment would therefore be higher. Again, in regard to assessment on wet lands, the commutation rate of 11 chs. per parah would apply to the whole of the paddy assessment under the same rule. The paddy assessment in the taluk was commuted into money at the rate of 6 chs. per parah for three-fourths of the quantity and 11 chs. per parah for the remaining one-fourth. The assessment under the Karampathippu Rules would therefore be very much higher. In addition to the above grievances, the tax due as per karampathippu decision could be levied from the date of alienation, provided that not more than five years' assessment could be levied in any case. He argued that the rule was unjust and was contrary to the provisions of para 31 of the Royal Proclamation relating to the recent settlement, which clearly stated that no interference of any kind would be permitted with the new settlement when it was completed, for the next 30 years. The Member was of opinion that the rules restricted the free alienation of properties. He also objected to the distinction made between the Brahmin and non-Brahmin Jenmies in the rules. The rules might also create further difficulties in the separate rights of the Jenmi and the Kudiyan. There were very many Madampimarvaka lands in the Tiruvalla taluk and a favourable modification of the rules would relieve the people of the taluk from many of the above-mentioned hardships.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

13. Redress of certain grievances under the Land Conservancy Regulation.

Mr. Ousep Avira Tarakan (Member, Nominated) said that the maximum tharavila and assessment on lands reclaimed from backwaters, canals, etc., was unsettled. The amounts had gone very high in recent years to the detriment of the poor ryots. In the case of the inhabitants of the Shertalay taluk, the grievance was more serious. There, the value of the land was very low, and the tharavila on the kayal porambokes was often higher than the market price of land. Further, they had not adequate facilities for cultivation. Reclamation was more costly for them. Want of facilities for the cultivation of the assessed *Kari* lands of the taluk was complained of by them on several occasions. The provision of bunds in certain canals in the taluk such as the Penadi chira, Pulluveli and Pallithodu, had not yet attracted the attention of the Government. More than 50,000 parahs of paddy fields were lying fallow every year and, if the present state of affairs were to continue, it would soon reduce a good many of the ryots of the taluk to extreme poverty.

In regard to the registry of puduvals, the Member affirmed that it was the intention of the Government to secure extension of cultivation by encouraging the ryots to take up lands and affording them facilities for doing so, as evidenced by Rule 40 of the Puduval Rules. But the high rate of tharavila precluded the ryots from going in for puduval registry. The Member therefore prayed for the following concessions for the inhabitants of Karappuram:—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly